

2786

2121

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: T2701.DIV

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Lovell B. Ivie et al.

Serial No.:

09/004,040

Filed:

January 7, 1998

JAN 0 8 2003

RECEIVED

For:

INFORMATION COMMUNICATION

Technology Center 2100

SYSTEMS

Examiner:

V. Srivastava

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

AND

CHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE AND FEE ADDRESS

RECEIVED

JAN 1 4 2003

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D. C. 20231 Technology Center 2600

Sir:

Responsive to the communication mailed October 2, 2002, Applicant hereby responds to the restriction requirement as set forth below.

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

GRANT R. CLAYTON

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 32,462

CORRESPONDENCE AND FEE ADDRESS

.1

Please change the correspondence address and fee address to:

Customer No. 20451

Please direct all telephonic and facsimile communications to:

Grant R. Clayton
Telephone: (801) 255-5335
Facsimile: (801) 255-5338

Applicant notes that the communication mailed October 2, 2002, was sent to an incorrect address even though the Office file index for this application indicates that a "change of address" was entered in this application on "8/26/02." Applicant again requests that the proper address be implemented for this application.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Office Action asserts that restriction to one of the following inventions is required: Group I - Claims 1-10, drawn to a communications cable installation; Group II - Claims 11-14, drawn to adapting multiline telephone hub; Group III - Claims 15-19, drawn to distributing audio signals from a central location; and, Group IV - Claims 20-24, drawn to distributing audio and video. Applicant does not elect any of the above recited claims since all such claims have been cancelled, without prejudice, by Applicant in a Preliminary Amendment filed on August 18, 1999 (Rule 8 date).

PAPERS MISSING FROM THE OFFICE FILE

:1

In fact, it now appears to Applicant that a number of papers which have been filed in the present application may have not been associated with the Office file for this application. All such papers which Applicant suspects have not been associated with the Office file for this application are listed below in Table A, with copies thereof being provided herewith as well as the postcard receipt for the respective paper bearing the Office mail room stamp.

TABLE A						
Refer- ence	Title of Paper	Filing Date (Rule 8 dates)	Comments			
Paper A	Preliminary Amendment and Change of Corre- spondence Address	August 18, 1999	This Amendment cancelled, without prejudice, claims 1-24 and added new claims 25-47, but the new claims were not acknowledged in the communication mailed October 2, 2002. See footnote 1.			

Refer- ence	Title of Paper	Filing Date (Rule 8 dates)	Comments
Paper B	Preliminary Amendment [B]	February 14, 2001	This Amendment added new claims 48-56, but the new claims were not acknowledged in the communication mailed October 2, 2002. Applicant notes that the enclosed copy of this paper bears a stamp showing that it was received in Technology Center 2600 on March 23, 2001, but yet the claims added by this Preliminary Amendment were not acknowledged in the communication mailed October 2, 2002.1

(continued...)

Applicant also notes, as shown by the hand written correction on the enclosed copy of Paper B, which was filed on February 14, 2001, included a one digit typographical error in the serial number provided on the paper. Still, the action taken in the Paper B was not acknowledged in the communication mailed on October 2, 2002. Applicant submits that in view of the Rule 8 certificates and the returned postcard receipts, that Papers A, B, and C were actually received by the Office and must be considered as filed. It appears, however, that Papers A and C were not associated with the Office file after they were received by the Office. Applicant notes that due to an inadvertent error the serial numbers recited on Papers A and C were incorrect. Applicant notes, however, that all of the other information set forth in the captions of Papers A and C is correct, namely:

^{1.} The inventors are correctly set forth as Lovell B. Ivie et al.;

^{2.} The title of the application is correctly identified as INFORMATION COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS;

^{3.} The filing date of the application is correctly set forth as January 7, 1998; and,

Refer- ence	Title of Paper	Filing Date (Rule 8 dates)	Comments
Paper C	Information Disclosure Statement Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97	February 21, 2001	See footnote 1.

Applicant requests that Papers A, B, and C all be entered into the present file prior to examination of this application and that the restriction requirement set forth in the communication mailed October 10, 2002 be withdrawn.

Any deficiency in the fee required by this paper may be charged to Deposit Account 50-0836.

¹(...continued)

^{4.} The attorney reference number is correctly set forth as T2701.DIV.

Thus, Applicant submits that Papers A and C were bearing all correct information except for the inadvertent erroneous recitation of the serial number. Thus, Applicant submits that the application was sufficiently identified in Papers A and C and that all such papers were suitably filed and must be considered by the Office. Applicant requests that Papers A and C now be associated with the Office proper file. Applicant apologizes for any inconvenience the inadvertent erroneous recitation of the serial number has caused.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims now pending present allowable subject matter. Thus, favorable action concerning these claims is respectfully requested.

DATED this 2 day of January, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

GRANT R. CLAYTON Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 32,462

CLAYTON, HOWARTH & CANNON, P.C. P.O. Box 1909
Sandy, Utah 84091
Telephone (801) 255-5335
Facsimile (801) 256-2043

S:\CHC Files\T 2--\T2701\T2701.DIV\restrespa.040.wpd